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Abstract
In the unending search for knowledge, this paper examines the critical role played by supervision and evaluation as strategies for the success of the universal Basic education (UBE) programme. The work begins with an introduction which gives the reader a general background to the paper. The paper also x-rays the tenets of the UBE programme. Thus the paper aims at identifying the benefits of monitoring and evaluation as a country. The paper concludes that when the appropriate strategy for evaluation of the scheme has been put into practice, it will provide an internal driving force which the UBE needs to succeed.

INTRODUCTION
Several attempts had been made in the past to increase the literacy rate in Nigeria. These include the 1955 Comprehensive Education law of Western Nigeria, 1957 Universal Primary Education of the Eastern Region, and the 1976 Universal Primary Education (UPE). Today the Universal Basic Education (USE) is with us. It aims at equipping individuals with such knowledge, skills and attitudes which will enable them live meaningful and fulfilling lives; contribute to the development of the society, derive maximum social, economic and cultural benefits from the society and discharge their civil obligations competently (FGN 1997). For this purpose huge investments have been made. These investments may be wasted and the envisaged benefits lost if the programme is not effectively implemented, monitored, supervised and periodically evaluated. This paper presents supervision and evaluation strategies which when used would ensure success of the UBE Programme and guard against the mistakes of the past. To achieve this, the paper will address the meaning of supervision and evaluation in the tenets of UBE, the role of supervision and evaluation of UBE before finally suggesting the strategies which would ensure sustained effect of the UBE.

What is Supervision
Supervision comprises two complementary processes, which Hornby (1974) puts as “watch and direct”. He maintains that this watching and directing concerns work, workers and/or an organization. Enns (1968) defines Educational Supervision as concerned with those particular activities and aspects which maintain and promote the effectiveness of teaching and learning in schools. In his own idea, Nwaogu (1980) views supervision as a process of activity in which the individual by means of advising and simulating interest in teachers and students helps to improve teaching and learning through effective teaching. Agreeing with the above views Gang (1990) puts it simply that supervision is an attempt to improve the quality of instruction. She quotes Lovell (1982) which defines supervision as the interaction between the organizational behaviour system and the teaching behaviour system for the purpose of improving the learning situation in children. To sum up the above, supervision of the UBE programme would involved the watching and directing of all facets which would have direct and indirect dealings with the operation of the scheme. These however include the subject teacher, the head of department or the sectional head, the head teacher, the school inspectors, the budgetary allocation and other ministry functionaries as well as the community agencies.
What is Evaluation
The dictionary definition of evaluation denotes finding out or deciding the amount or value of a particular phenomenon. Obioma (1990) defines evaluation as the qualitative judgment, which results from assessment, based on quantitative or qualitative data from the tools of testing and measurement.

Ugodulunwa and Ugwuanyi (1999) report that evaluation is chiefly carried out through tests. They see evaluation as comprising testing measurement and assessment. As far as UBE is concerned, evaluation of the programme would involve sample testing the products of the scheme to ascertain the level of literacy acquired as well as survey of the percentage level of literacy in the nation. This would be compared to the starting point statistics as recorded in the implementation blueprint (FGN 1997). This would be a comprehensive evaluation of the programme. There is however the need for periodic evaluation of each of the processes and decisions put in so as to ensure acceptability and effectiveness so that the end product would be desirable.

The Tenets of UBE
University Basic Education (UBE) as introduced in Nigeria in 1998 seems to be a new phenomenon. A careful look at the programme would reveal that there are only a few variations from other attempts aimed at mass education of Nigerians and promoting literacy rate in the country. By this, reference is made to the 1955 Comprehensive Education Law in Western Nigeria, the 1957 Universal Primary Education in the Eastern region and the 1976 attempt at Universal Primary Education (UPE). In specific terms, UBE denotes a foundation for life-long learning where the basics of literacy are inculcated in citizens using the formal and non-formal educational activities.

As already seen above the aims are laudable as it gears towards 100% functional literacy of citizens. The specific targets are children of primary school age and secondary school up to the JS3 class. It also makes provision for school drop outs to benefit from its adult literacy scheme. Those who may not have the opportunity of attending a normal school system are also provided for by the nomadic school system.

Roles and responsibilities are assigned among the federal, state and local governments on one hand, local communities, voluntaries agencies and nongovernmental organization on the other hand. The federal government is to enact the necessary legislation for the scheme, (which it has already done) make available the national guidelines, coordinate, supervise and monitor the implementation as well as provide the infrastructure and finance for the successful implementation of the scheme. It is also the responsibility of the federal government to facilitate, monitor and evaluate the scheme. The State and the Local Government have similar responsibilities but each has a limited scope depending on coverage area. It is worthy of note that while the federal government supervises and evaluates the scheme in the state for there to be a nation wide report, the State is expected to supervise and evaluates the implementation in the Local Government areas to come out with a State wide report. This State is expected to “evaluate, submit biannual progress report on the scheme to the federal government” (FGN 1997:5) while the Local Government submits “periodic” progress reports on the scheme to the State Government. These arrangements place responsibilities where they belong and supposedly ensures that evaluation would be carried out appropriately so that reports would be given to appropriate quarters at the stipulated time. It has however failed to stipulate the strategies which would be used for the supervision and evaluation so that the exercise would be uniform in all the states. These strategies are the main thrust of this paper. But before that, it is worthy to highlight the importance of these two constructs to the scheme.
The Role of Supervision and Evaluation In UBE

For the avoidance of doubt, supervision and evaluation in any scheme as well as the UBE provides the following benefits. After implementation of the scheme, supervision ensures that the provision is clearly understood by the practitioners and the provides of the basic education in question. It ensures that these practitioners are implementing correctly what the provisions are and that they are sincere in their efforts and the provision. Supervision further ensures that the infrastructure provided are not diverted but are properly used for the scheme. These infrastructures include the buildings, teaching equipment, furniture and in some cases funds. In short supervision ensures internal effectiveness and efficiency which would be assessed during evaluation.

Evaluation on its own part would examine the quality and quantity of executors on ground in terms of the amount of governmental and non governmental bodies involved in the implementation of the scheme; the number of teachers, pupils, classrooms, furniture and other infrastructure. Evaluation would also provide base-line data on area of effectiveness which need to be maintained and areas of weakness which should be improved upon periodic results of evaluation would present the trend and the blueprint for adjustments and remediation for the scheme as may be necessary.

Suggested Strategies for Supervision and Evaluation

From our definition of supervision, it can be noted that supervision is an ongoing process in a scheme such as the UBE. Therefore for one to imagine the supervisor being distant from the supervisee would be erroneous. UBE has to rely heavily on in-built intra-mural supervision. By this I mean the establishment of a supervisory chain whereby subject teachers have collegial supervision as well as being supervised by sectional heads. These sectional heads are supervised by head teachers who are in turn supervised by the appropriate arm of the Local Government Ministry. In this process the Local Government will be supervised by the State and the State by the Federal Government.

In addition to this hierarchical arrangement, Intra-mural supervision provides for supervision where teachers of the same subjects supervise themselves in a collegial and co-operative manner. For instance, the supervision of the teaching exercise would have two or more teachers of supposedly equal competence and qualification seating in to evaluate and give corrections at the end while a colleague of theirs teaches. This is only an example of an aspect of which goes in the teaching - learning situation. In the UBE, therefore Intra-mural supervision would enable class teachers, sectional heads, head teachers and even appointed ministerial supervisors to have peer supervision.

This Intra-mural supervision as a new innovation in the supervision of education promises to remove the boss subordinate relationship which entrenches fear and dependence from the system. It also makes for the lapses which may arise from in-experienced appointed supervisors in the Board. You will agree with me that, with the on set of the UBE, fresh graduates who may never have taught in life have been appointed. In supervision some amount of experience is required on the job which one is supervising.

In the fresh graduate’s case, from where will he get this experience? Apart from the removal of unthorough discharge of duties by appointed inexperienced supervisors, Intra-mural supervision is a source of up-dating professional competence of the practitioner. There is therefore a need to organize a workshop where the basics of Intra-mural supervision would be disseminated. Workshop on its own is another strategy for effective supervision.
As a follow up to intra-mural supervision, intra-station supervision would be used. This entails, a colleague of equal competence and qualification, supervising and reporting on another colleague who had been posted to another station. This approach exposes innovations in the field to the supervising colleague as well as giving him opportunity to introduce the innovations in his school to his supervisee.

Just like in supervision, peer assessment is important but for objectivity and for documentation purposes, there is need for evaluation to follow the hierarchical arrangement. This hierarchical arrangement in evaluation would not exclude self and peer evaluation in the performance of one’s duties excepting that documents would be issued, collected, collated and interpreted by a superior officer. Evaluation should come in the form of a survey (if need be in a questionnaire form) and should cover areas such as:

1. Number of teachers and support staff available in the field as classified into LGA’s and States.
2. Number of UBE centers, by these we mean schools classification into operating bodies e.g. Government, NGO, voluntary agency etc.
3. Enrolment of pupils.
4. Number of training institutions and enrolment in these institutions.
5. Infrastructure available for the scheme (classrooms, furniture and other materials).
6. Graduates from training institutions year by year and weighting them against the enrolment (appropriate student: teacher ratio).
7. Job satisfaction of functionaries and the level of their performance.
8. Difficulties encountered in the field and possible solutions pilot tested.
9. Quality of products, practitioners and supports
10. Management of resources e.g., time.
12. Curriculum

All these are evaluations which are carried on as the scheme progresses. On the overall view, there is need to assess the level of literacy in the country every 5 years and compare the result with the starting point statistic such that a trend could be observed. This periodic comparison especially when taken with the number of graduates of the scheme would advise the nation to look else where for the needed solution.

Conclusion
The UBE has been lunched in Nigeria as a fertile hope at reducing illiteracy rate to zero percent (0%). Huge sums have been appropriated towards making it work. The hidden fear in the minds of the people is an imminent collapse as in previous attempts. This paper proposes intra-mural and inter-station strategies of supervision to energize, and encourage practitioners to produce the desired result. An appropriate strategy for evaluation of the scheme has also been proposed. These when put into practice promise to provide an internal driving force which UBE needs to succeed.
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